

REMARKS

This amendment accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed March 1, 2007.

With regard to Examiner's Response to Arguments made in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has misunderstood Applicant's argument. Specifically, Applicant submits that what Examiner has cited in Ewing (U.S. patent 7,043,543) as the equivalent to the claimed limitation, found in independent claims 1, 12, and 16, of a network switch coupled to a power transformer and including a network port array in operative communication between the interior and the exterior is nothing more than a plurality of control jacks mounted on a circuit board. Furthermore, these control jacks are not disclosed in Ewing to be connected to a power transformer. While the Examiner cited that none of the claims in the instant application claim the subject matter of a "set of control jacks coupled to a power transformer," Applicant submits that the Examiner failed to consider that the plurality of control jacks was cited by the Examiner as anticipation of the network switch of the claimed limitation. Applicant pointed out in numerous examples that the plurality of control jacks cannot be construed as the equivalent of the network port array of the present application, as claimed in independent claims 1, 12 and 16.

Without showing that the combined references of Ewing and Nguyen (U.S. Patent 5,506,790) anticipate every claim limitation for the claims against which they are offered, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case that is required to support a rejection under 35 USC 103(a).

Furthermore, Applicant again submits that the Examiner has failed to make any statement as to any motivation to combine Ewing and Nguyen, and simply said that it would be obvious to combine the two references to arrive at Applicant's invention.

Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that Examiner has employed impermissible hindsight to arrive at Applicant's invention, and reminds Examiner that there must be some motivation to combine the references in the references themselves, or in the knowledge of one skilled in the art, in order to support a 35 USC 103(a) rejection. If Examiner feels the motivation to combine Ewing and Nguyen comes from the references themselves, or from one skilled in the art, Applicant respectfully requests evidence supporting such an assertion.

Regarding dependent claims 2-11, 13-15, and 17-20, Applicant submits that Examiner has failed to show any grounds for rejection of these claims. If these claims are to be rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as cited by Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to provide some citations to Ewing and/or Nguyen supporting such a rejection.

INVITATION TO TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

If the Examiner feels that any remaining issues can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone listed below.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has addressed all grounds for rejection and objection as stated in the Office action mailed March 1, 2007, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and place this application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Date: April 9, 2007

/john w. crosby/

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202
Minden, Nevada 89423
Telephone: (775) 586-9500

John W. Crosby
Reg. No. 49,058